

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of his innocence. In the case at bar the evidence establishes only a suspicion of guilt, which is not sufficient.

CATHERINE BUNDICK V. COMMONWEALTH.—Decided at Richmond, November 23, 1899.—Cardwell, J.

1. CRIMINAL LAW—Burglary—Case at bar—Evidence insufficient. The evidence in the case at bar is insufficient to convict the plaintiff in error of burglary. The footprints found are not shown to have been hers. A two dollar bill found in her possession the next day, and about which she made conflicting statements, is not identified as the same note stolen when the house was entered, and other articles found in her possession belonging to inmates of the house in which she had been a servant are not shown to have been in the house when entered. Although she knew where the owner of the house kept his money, and also the tools with which the house was broken, all of the employees about the house had the same knowledge.

Cady v. Straus. — Decided at Richmond, December 7, 1899. — Keith, P.

- 1. Contracts—Attorney to collect—Offer to sell at discount—Withdrawal of offer. If an attorney to collect a claim accept a proposition to purchase it at a discount, subject to the approval of his client, such acceptance is merely an undertaking to communicate the proposition to the client, and the proposition may be withdrawn at any time before acceptance by him.
- 2. Contracts—Mutuality—Offer—Withdrawal. Mutuality of obligation is of the essence of a contract, and it is binding upon neither party until a point is reached where the minds of the parties accede to one and the same set of terms. A mere offer may be withdrawn at any time before acceptance.

Tunis Lumber Co. v. Dennis Lumber Co.—Decided at Richmond, December 7, 1899. Buchanan, J.

- 1. LANDLORD AND TENANT—Fixtures—Agreement of parties. Parties may, by agreement, fix the character and control the disposition of property, which, in the absence of such agreement, would be held to be a fixture, if no absurdity, or general inconvenience will result from the transaction.
- 2. Landlord and Tenant—Fixture—Buildings erected by tenant pursuant to covenant. Buildings erected by a tenant on the leased premises, pursuant to a covenant in the lease which obliges him to erect them, are not removable as trade fixtures unless the right of removal is expressly or impliedly reserved in the lease.
- 3. LANDLORD AND TENANT—Fixtures—Buildings voluntarily erected by tenant. Between landlord and tenant it is an essential element of removable structures that they be erected by the tenant of his own volition and for his own benefit, intending that they should remain his property, and not in fulfilment of a duty or obligation owing by him to the leasor.
- 4. LANDLORD AND TENANT—Fixtures—Buildings voluntarily erected by tenant. Whether or not a structure erected by a tenant on the leased premises is a trade